

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated October 2, 2006. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-13 are under consideration in this application. Claims 1-2 and 13 are being amended, as set forth in the above marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to more particularly define and distinctly claim applicant's invention.

All the amendments to the claims are supported by the specification. Applicant hereby submits that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Allowed Subject Matter

Claim 12 was allowed, and claims 3-5 and 8-11 would be allowed if rewritten into independent form to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-2, 6-7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over US Pub. No. 2005/0219163 of Smith et al. (hereinafter "Smith") in view of US Pub. No. 2004/0239586 of Cok (hereinafter "Cok"), and claim 7 was rejected over Smith '163 and Cok '586 in view of US Pub. No. 2003/0197666 of Akimoto et al. (hereinafter "Akimoto"). These rejections have been carefully considered, but are most respectfully traversed.

The image display device of the present invention (for example, the embodiment shown in Figs. 1 & 3, pp. 13-18), as now recited in claim 1, comprises: a pixel having a light emitting device which is driven to emit light on the basis of a display signal current; a display unit constructed by a plurality of said pixels arranged in a matrix; a signal line for passing said display signal current to said pixels; write pixel selecting means for selecting at least one row or column of said pixels to which said display signal current is to be passed via said signal line from

said plurality of pixels; and display signal current generating means for generating said display signal current. In particular, the write pixel selecting means has a function of selecting N rows or columns of pixels simultaneously, N is an integer equal to or bigger than 2 (*“Although the number N of columns of pixels selected simultaneously is 3 in the embodiment, N may be an arbitrary value from 2 to the number of pixels in the column direction.”* P. 14, lines 12-14).

The invention recited in claim 13 is directed to the image display device of claim 1 and further comprises storing means for storing data fetched from the outside.

As admitted by the Examiner (p. 3, lines 1-2 of the outstanding Office Action), Smith does not teach said write pixel selecting means has a function of selecting N pixels simultaneously. As such, Smith neither teaches “said write pixel selecting means has a function of selecting N rows or columns of pixels simultaneously” as the present invention. Cok was relied upon by the Examiner to provide such a teaching. However, Cok’s pixel selecting means for writing display signals simultaneously selects *only one* row pixels (p. 2, [0026]), rather than *two or more* row/column of pixels as the present invention.

Applicants contend that the cited references and their combinations fail to teach or disclose each and every feature of the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 13. As such, the present invention as now claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the rejections raised in the Office Action. The withdrawal of the outstanding prior art rejections is in order, and is respectfully solicited.


Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344



Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

February 2, 2007

SPF/JCM/JT